

R E M A R K S

This paper is in response to the Office Action dated December 22, 2006. Claims 1 and 7 are amended and claim 8 is added without prejudice or disclaimer as to the subject matter involved. Claims 1 – 8 are in the application upon entry of this amended. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 – 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons given on pages 2 – 3 of the official action. Specifically, the Examiner finds claim 1 to be unclear as to the phrases “such as” and “for example”. To overcome this problem, Applicant has removed reference to the examples of mild reducing agents as being unnecessary for a full understanding of the claim. The specific agents are recited in claims 4 – 6 and 8. Applicant avers that with these amendments following the suggestions of the Examiner the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 is overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal thereof are respectfully requested.

As to the objection to claim 7, Applicant rewrites claim 7 as suggested in order to advance the prosecution of the instant application. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner’s indication that claims 1 – 6 contain allowable subject matter. Applicant submits that the instant claims 1 – 8 as now amended are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the Examiner to find them allowable. Applicant invites the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record if the Examiner feels such a call would advance the prosecution of the above-identified application.

Respectfully submitted,

USPTO Customer No. 26748
Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc.
Patent and Trademark Dept.
410 Swing Road
Greensboro, NC 27409
(336) 632-7706

/William A. Teoli, Jr./
William A. Teoli, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 33,104

Date: March 22, 2007